

The following are the PACE IV RFP questions received and their associated answers.

Question #1: Attachment C - Incumbent Current GSA LC & Descriptions – Job Title: Program Manager / Level 3 – specifies “A Master’s degree” Is Master’s degree a requirement for the Program Manager that will be proposed or can experience be submitted for master’s degree. If so, how many years/ Please clarify this.

Answer #1: Attachment J-14, the pdf file labeled “Attachment C Incumbent Current GSA L.C. & DESCRIPTIONS” is a listing of the labor categories and their descriptions from GSA. The example listed is for a program manager at level 3. Submit the Program Manager that best fits your proposal and their associated pay scale.

Question #2: Section L.15-2(f) Table L-1 indicates a “Price Summary (EPM Template)” shall be submitted with Cost Volume – Part 1. However, no Price Summary EPM Template was provided with the Solicitation.

Answer #2: The Price Summary Template is now provided as Attachment J-17.

Question #3: Section L.15-2(f) Table L-1 indicates an “IDIQ Price Template” shall be submitted with Cost Volume – Part 2. However, no IDIQ Price Template was provided with the Solicitation.

Answer #3: The IDIQ Price Template is now provided as Attachment J-16.

Question #4: Section L.15-2(f) Table L-1 indicates the “Offeror Pricing Model (OPM)” shall be submitted with Cost Volume – Part 3. However, Section L does not define what is to be included in the OPM.

Answer #4: This is the Offeror’s Pricing Model that was used by the Offeror to estimate their contract costs. The Offeror defines the content of this OPM.

Question #5: Section L.15-2(m) indicates “Offerors and Major Subcontractors shall submit a single Summary Template wherein the ‘Price Template CA#s’ costs are summarized.” I believe this is also what the Government has referred to as “Price Summary (EPM Template)” in Section L.15(f) Table L-1 Cost Volume Part 1. Can you please verify? If yes, a template should be provided since no Price Summary EPM Template was provided with the Solicitation.

Answer #5: Please refer to Answer 2.

Question #6: Section L.15-3 indicates Cost Volume, Part 1 is the Excel Pricing Model (EPM). However, Section L.15-2(f) Table L-1 lists Cost Volume, Part 1 as General Information. This is in error and should state General Cost Information to match Table L-1.

Answer #6: Agreed. On page 80, the Cost Volume, Part 1 is the “General Cost Information” as is listed in Table L-1.

Question #7: Section L.15-3, Section 2, Summary Cost Data says, “The offer shall provide a total price summary by CY year for the Phase-In, base effort, and all Options. The Price Summary template, part of the Excel Pricing Model shall be provided by the Offeror and each Major Subcontractor.” However, there is no Price Summary template or EMP template. The workbooks provided in the Solicitation are for the Core Work Areas, which would not provide a total price summary.

Answer #7: Reference the answer to question 2.

Question #8: Section L.16-3, Cost Volume, Part 2 – Excel Pricing Model (EPM) (a) states, “To ensure a consistent evaluation among Offerors, NASA is providing seven (7) Microsoft Excel files/workbooks designed to capture proposed cost information in an automated and standardized format. The seven Microsoft Excel workbooks are shown in Table L-3 below.” Table L-3 lists the following seven workbooks: Price Summary, Price Template CA1, Price Template CA2, Price Template CA3, IDIQ Price Template, IDIQ Rates, and CAOT. However, only 5 templates were provided. The Price Summary and IDIQ Price Template are not provided with the solicitation.

Answer #8: Reference the answer to question 2 for Price Summary Template and the answer to question 3 for the IDIQ Price Template.

Question #9: Section L.16-3, Cost Volume, Part 2 – Excel Pricing Model (EPM) (c) states, “The Price Summary Template summarizes the combined price by CY for the Price Template(s) CA1, CA2, and CA3. It also includes a line for the Phase-In price” However, the Price Summary Template was not provided with the solicitation.

Answer #9: Reference the answer to question 2.

Question #10: Section L.15-1(d) states, “The Government assumes that adequate price competition may exist, thereby negating the need for submission of certified cost and pricing data with this proposal submission (See FAR 15.403-1)” FAR 15.403-1 indicates that the CO shall not require submission of cost or pricing data to support any action when the CO determines that prices agreed upon are based on adequate price competition. The CO can request information other than cost or pricing data to support a determination of price reasonable or cost realism. However, Section L, Cost Volume Part 3 – Offeror’s Pricing Model (OMP) on page 88, indicated the OPM shall follow the format specified in Table 15-2 of FAR 15.408, but this is instructions for submitting Cost/Price Proposals when cost or pricing data are required. Since the RFP indicates adequate price competition negates the need for cost or pricing data, why is the Government asking for Cost or Pricing Data as part of the OPM?

Answer #10: The instructions are for the formatting information only. The instructions are asking for non-certified pricing information in the event DCAA certification has not yet been achieved.

Question # 11: In Section L.13.3.A (p. 74) of the final RFP, the government changed the language of the draft RFP to state “The Offeror shall provide a demonstration version of the WMS on a CD, in a working test environment.” This instruction raises several questions:

Question #11.a: Based on the change, it appears that the text “ ..., in a working test environment” may be an artifact left over from the draft RFP, because a CD demonstration is generally incompatible with a working test environment. Will the government remove this phrase to provide offerors with a clearer indication of how to provide a compliant response to the instruction?

Question #11.b: If the Government’s intent is to leave the instruction as currently stated in the final RFP, please clarify the Government’s meaning of “a CD, in a working test environment.” A CD is a read-only medium incapable of accessing data from a database server or hosting database-driven web pages. Given these limitations, how does the government wish offerors to prepare a CD for use in a test environment?

Question #11.c: If the Government’s intent is to leave the instruction is currently stated in the final RFP, does the Government intend for the CD to contain a WMS demonstration version that the Government can

install in a test environment for evaluation purposes? If this is the case, offerors will require much more information regarding the configuration of the test environment, security of the environment, access issues, licensing issues, etc. Is the government prepared to address these specifications with offerors?

Question #11.d: Please clarify how the Government defines a “demonstration version of the WMS.” Is a Flash video demonstration of the system with voice over, screen captures, etc. considered sufficient?

Answer #11a: The PACE IV SEB has posted a revision to the RFP. Instead of a CD, a URL site with the WMS is now required. Offerors shall provide a Web URL address and necessary access information (e.g., user ID and password) in the Mission Suitability Volume to the proposed WMS that would allow evaluators to access a working test environment of the proposed WMS. For clarification on demonstration version and working test environment, please see the next questions.

Answer #11b: A demonstration version of the WMS is a runtime version of the software that is fully functional and production-ready. The working environment can be as simple as including sample data in order to exercise the functionality.

Answer #11c: The PACE IV SEB has posted a revision to the RFP. Instead of a CD, a URL site with the WMS is now required.

Answer #11d: A demonstration version of the WMS is a runtime version of the software that is fully functional and production-ready. In order to exercise the functionality, sample data may need to be included as well. A Flash demonstration with screenshots and voiceovers of the WMS is not sufficient. However, it may be included on the website as a tutorial.

Question #12: For solutions that are web based (i.e. cloud hosted) it is impossible to create a working test environment on a CD. A CD is a read-only medium incapable of accessing data from a server or hosting database-driven web pages.

Answer #12: Reference answers to question 11.

Question #13: Page, 87 j(4) should also include G&A as this is an indirect cost associated with direct labor.

Answer #13: Offeror may include, on a separate template, other indirect labor costs specific to an Offeror's cost methodology.

Question #14: CST and CA SOW for all Core Work Areas should allow for G&A on Indirect Labor Costs. G&A should be added under Total Overhead and should also be included on the ILCT.

Answer #14: Reference answer to question 13.

Question #15: CST and CA SOW for all Core Work Areas should allow for subcontractor pass thru on Subcontractor Costs. However, this is not provided in the spreadsheet. Please indicate where subcontractor pass thru should be accounted for.

Answer #15: Offerors may provide additional, supplemental spreadsheets with explanations that clarify their cost proposal.

Question #16: Do you want the Offeror and Major Subcontractors to provide a spreadsheet tab for each indirect labor rate in order show the buildup of indirect labor rates? At this point, only OHT and GAT are requested.

Answer #16: Offerors may provide additional, supplemental spreadsheets with explanations that clarify their cost proposal.

Question #17: On the LPT, there is no Year 6 rate column.

Answer #17: LPT tab in Attachments J-5, J-6, and J-7 now includes columns for Year 6

Question #18: The following information is missing from EPM and Attachment C Incumbent GSA LC & Descriptions. Can you provide additional information?

EPM: Computer Security Systems Spec Level 2	Att C: Only a Level 1 is listed
EPM: Intranet Engineer	Att C: No description
EPM: Principal Subject Matter Expert Level 3	Att C: No description
EPM: Sr. Subject Matter Expert Level 4	Att C: No description
EPM: Sr. Subject Matter Expert Level 7	Att C: No description
EPM: Standardization Specialist	Att C: No description
EPM: Subject Matter Expert Level 5	Att C: No description
EPM: Program Admin Specialist Level1	Att C: No description

Answer #18: Attachment J-14 has been updated. J-14 is a list of sample labor categories utilized currently. The list is not meant to be all inclusive for every possible labor category. Offeror is asked to map their labor categories with as much fidelity as possible to the labor category descriptions provided. If there are Offeror labor categories that do not crosswalk, the Offeror shall provide the labor category descriptions or supplement the labor category descriptions provided to close the gap.

Question #19: The Government has asked the Offeror to price travel, materials, ODCs, facilities, etc., however, there are no specific requirements in these areas for Offeror's to price. In order to do a fair total price evaluation, would the Government please provide set amounts for these items?

Answer #19: The Offeror's response is dependent on their approach to the technical requirements. Provide your basis of estimate with supporting rationale.

Question #20: Section L.2(c)(2), page 60, states that the first page of the proposal must show: (i) The solicitation number (v) Name, title, and signature of person authorized to sign the proposal. Does the first page of the proposal refer to the binder cover, cover letter or page 1 of the proposal?

Answer #20: Referenced information should appear on the cover letter.

Question #21: Does NASA have any SOW requirements for the following specific SOW areas: 3.1.5 IT Service Management, 3.7.3 IT Security Administration Support, 3.3 Computing Services, 3.9 Customer Experience; realizing that each SOW area mentioned does contain sub-sections below it in the SOW structure that do have requirements.

Answer #21: The requirements for 3.1.5, 3.7.3, 3.3, and 3.9 are included in their sub-sections.

Question #22: Section L.9(b), page 66, statesusing not smaller than 11 point Arial type, including tables, figures and graphics. Would the government consider a smaller type size for tables, figures and graphics?

Answer #22: Smaller than 11 point font may be used for figures, tables, charts, and graphics within the written proposals so long as the figure, table, chart, or graphic does not consist primarily of text and can be reasonably read by the evaluators. If the information is unable to be deciphered it will not be evaluated.

Question #23: SOW 3.7.1, "Contractor shall proactively assess and design network architecture changes involving the GRC IT security infrastructure..." Will the Contractor have access to NASA IT lab facilities (e.g. Appendix M Test Facility) to perform this task or is this a desktop only assessment

Answer #23: The Contractor will be given appropriate access to do the job.

Question #24: SOW 3.7.2.1, Please identify which Traffic Capturing and Analysis tool is used at NASA GRC.

Answer #24: This section of the SOW is to provide scope for future potential work to support a Data Loss Prevention (DLP) environment. This DLP environment is not yet implemented at GRC. It is predicted that the future potential DLP environment, if implemented, will be based on Verdasys technologies.

Question #25: SOW 3.7.2.2, "Perform vulnerability scanning and produce reports to meet the Agency quarterly scanning requirements. This will consist of monthly scans and quarterly reports." Is scanning done monthly or quarterly?

Answer #25: Scanning is performed at least monthly. Additionally, scanning is performed at the request of the System Owners.

Question #26: SOW 3.7.7, "The Contractor shall hold a degree in Information Technology or a related discipline, Education, Mass Communications or Marketing or hold an appropriate certification." Does this requirement apply to the entire Contractor team, the Contractor's IT Security Awareness and Training Lead, or to individuals who deliver training?

Answer #26: This requirement applies only to the Contractor employees performing work under SOW 3.7.7.

Question #27: Appendix L a), "Develop and implement Agency and GRC IT security awareness training as directed by the Government. This includes computer-based, classroom, virtual classroom, and individualized instruction." Is the selected Contractor required to develop computer based training packages? Is so, please provide any technical specifications beyond those listed.

Answer #27: Yes. The contractor is required to provide storybook or PowerPoint representations to the NASA Shared Services Center (NSSC) for programming into the current Learning Management System (SATERN). The NSSC performs the programming of the storybook or PowerPoint representations into SATERN. The Contractor will provide the content to the NSSC. The NSSC programming is out of scope of the PACE IV SOW.

Question #28: Appendix L d), "... serve as an administrator to the NASA learning management system (SATERN)" Is SATERN a COTS or GOTS product? If COTS, please identify the product.

Answer #28: GOTS

Question #29: L.9 Section B. Due to the specific detail of graphics and tables, will the Government permit that text within graphics be no less than Arial 9 point, and no less than Arial 10 point in tables?

Answer #29: Reference answer to question 22.

Question #30: L.9 Volume II Past Performance. The Government reduced the amount of pages provided in the draft from 50 pages to 20 pages in the final RFP. Due to the amount of information required from the

Government, will the Government consider increasing the page count of the Past Performance Volume to 30 pages?

Answer #30: The 20 page limitation will remain as a requirement. The information being requested in the 20 page limit is the past performance narrative outlined on pages 75 and 76 of the RFP.

Question #31: L.12. The Government is requesting that all proposals be bound using plastic bindings. Does the Government mean GBC bindings or 3-Ring binders. Please clarify.

Answer #31: Offeror's discretion.

Question #32: Can the contractor provide an online demonstration version of the WMS if access is provided on the CD?

Answer #32: Reference answers to questions 11a-d.

Question #33: Can GRC provide an equipment list including operating system, databases, etc?

Answer #33: The details associated with equipment, operating systems, and databases can be found in the SOW, SOW appendices, and Core Work Areas.

Question #34: The customer requires that the WMS to authenticate to GRC's Launchpad. It is assumed that the integration of the WMS will occur during the 60-day transition. Can the Government clarify this assumption?

Answer #34: It is expected that the WMS integration into Launchpad will be performed during the 60-day phase-in.

Question #35: RFP Section G-14 states that "Performance under this contract will involve access to and/or generation of classified information, work in a security area, or both, up to the level of Top Secret. See Federal Acquisition Regulation clause 52.204-2 in this contract and DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specification, Attachment J-4." Since the DD 254 does not specify, could GRC advise its expectations for key or other personnel clearances?

Answer #35: It is expected that the Contractor shall obtain clearances during the phase-in period. At this time, security clearances are applicable to sections 3.8.3 and sections within 3.7 of the SOW.

Question #36: Question: Has the Government issued an associated Standard Form 30 (pdf file) for Amendment 0002 to be acknowledged, signed and returned with our proposal documents.

Answer #36: Amendment 0002 included only attachments; no SF-30 is required to be signed or associated with Amendment 0002.

Question #37: Section G.4, RFP page 10: Does this section of the RFP strictly apply ONLY to property purchased under this contract?

Answer #37: No. Refer to Section G.4 (a) (1) for applicable list.

Question #38: Please confirm that cross-reference/compliance matrices and glossaries/acronym lists will be excluded from the core page count for the Mission Suitability and Past Performance Volumes.

Answer #38: Cross-reference/compliance matrices and glossaries/acronym lists are included in the page count.

Question #39: Section L.9, RFP page 66: To assist the Government in receiving the best possible responses from industry for the PACE IV solicitation, please confirm the acceptability of using 9 point Arial Narrow font for all tables, figures, and graphics, rather than 11 point Arial font.

Answer #39: Reference answer to question 22.

Question #40: Section L.12(a)(3), RFP page 67: There is a reference to NFS 1815.307-70. Please confirm the proper reference is "1815.305-70" Identification of Unacceptable Proposals.

Answer #40: 1815.305-70 is correct. 1815.307-70 does not exist.

Question #41: Section L.15, Table L-1 appears somewhat inconsistent with Table L-3. For example, L-1 item 1 is Phase-in, but L-3 item 1 Price Summary; and L-3 doesn't mention Phase-in. Please clarify the requested EPM and workbook structure.

Answer #41: Offeror provides the phase-in spreadsheet. No template is provided.

Question #42: L.15.2.k, RFP p80; paragraph k includes this phrase: "For each Labor Category identified in Attachment J-8, IDIQ-Possible Tab, the WYEs ..." implies that J-8 is a workbook containing multiple tabs. However, J-8 is provided as a PDF; there are no tabs. Please clarify the instructions in L.15.2.k.

Answer #42: J-8 is provided for historical reference. J-9 is the workbook with tabs to be used to build up IDIQ rates.

Question #43: L.15; for the various pricing spreadsheets associated with each Work Area, should we use J-8 as a fixed basis for pricing, or was that table provided as general information?

Answer #43: J-8 is provided for historical reference.

Question #44: M.2 pg 96 Weighting of PPN=PPQ=PPD. However, not all government customers rigorously use CPARS. This might penalize offerors with significant NASA Past Performance, since NASA does regularly maintain such databases. How will a fair evaluation not penalize a team with limited available PPD?

Answer #44: CPARS is government-wide tool. The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on the combination of the past performance narrative, questionnaires, and past performance database information. Offerors with no relevant past performance will be rated as neutral in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv).

Question #45: SOW Appendix D, page 49, Please confirm the SOW element referenced in the title should be 3.2.7 rather than 3.2.6.

Answer #45: Yes, the element referenced in the title should be 3.2.7 rather than 3.2.6.

Question #46: All schedules provided have the same tabs, LPT, ILCT, ICT, etc. Should the data in these tabs be the same in each workbook?

Answer #46: Labor mix may vary for each of the work areas. If it is varied, each LPT, ILCT, ICT for each work area will vary accordingly.

Question #47: In schedule 155753-Amend-002-001, Tab IRT, cell E10 shows a superscript #3, yet there is no corresponding footnote. Please clarify.

Answer #47: The footnote for superscript 3 was added.

Question #48: In schedule 155753-Amend-002-001, tab IRT, cell D10: what is meant by "% Usage"?

Answer #48: If the Offeror's fiscal year is different than the contract year, the Offeror will use the IRT to calculate the weighted indirect non labor rates for the GFY based on a distribution of the Offeror's fiscal year.

Question #49: Schedule 155753-SOL-001-010, tab ADDL DO LABOR RATES DEVELOPMENT, cell L3 comment states, "There are 9 contract years. One schedule for each contract year is required." Can you please clarify this?

Answer #49: The reference to 9 contract years is incorrect. Provide for the 6 contract years and potential extension period of this contract.

Question #50: Is the Government going to provide a template for the calculation of the Phase In Costs?

Answer #50: Reference answer to question 41.

Question #51: Does the contractor require any clearances at time of award?

Answer #51: Reference answer to question 35.

Question #52: Can the work management system be hosted externally on non-government servers as a SaaS Service, or it has to be in government data center or location.

Answer #52: Reference answer to questions 11a-d.

Question #53: Approximately How many users will be using the WMS from the government side? Need clarifications to cost the software based on number of licenses required.

Answer #53: Approximately 100.

Question #54: Is it acceptable to the government that some of the support personnel not be located at Glenn and support calls be made to an outside call center?

Answer #54: Propose your best solution.

Question #55: Will all hosted sites be on government servers? Is there a need for contractor hosted services on contractor servers?

Answer #55: Yes, all hosted sites will be on government servers. No need foreseen at this time for contractor hosted services on contractor servers.

Question #56: Does the contractor need to address and/or have wind tunnel expertise/past performance from a non IT perspective?

Answer #56: No.

Question #57: Can the government give us any estimate of what percent of the work in the new task orders/RFP is new or different work versus the current contract?

Answer #57: The requirements for PACE III are not relevant to the evaluation of Offerors proposing to the PACE IV RFP.

Question #58: Does the contractor need to have DCAA approved rates/system or GSA Schedule 70 at time of award?

Answer #58: No. Offerors who do not have an approved accounting system pursuant to FAR 16.301-3(a)3 may, based on their sole discretion, employ at no cost to the Government a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) in good standing who shall prepare and execute an audit program designed for the evaluation of the Offeror's accounting system, generally accepted accounting principles and the requirements identified on SF-1408. A copy of the audit program, engagement letter, final review and executed SF-1408 signed in block 3 by the auditor shall be provided with the Cost Volume in Part 1, Section 3. The information will be reviewed by the Contracting Officer for a determination of acceptability of the Offeror's accounting system applicable to this contract only.

Question #59: L.14, Section A states that "the Offeror shall provide past experience and performance information for past or current contracts that are relevant in terms of size, content, and complexity.

L.14, Section B states: "The Offeror shall send three Past Performance Questionnaires per entity on the Offeror's proposing team."

How many Past Performance narratives are required for each prime offeror and major subcontractor?

Answer #59: The Offeror shall supply as many narratives as are relevant and that can fit within the page limits.

Question #60: Should each prime offeror and major subcontractor submit three Past Performance Questionnaires even if they do not provide Past Performance Narratives for three contracts?

Answer #60: Yes.

Question #61: Intentionally left blank.

Answer #61: Intentionally left blank.

Question #62: What equipment/GFE will you be providing?

Answer #62: Reference Section L.15.2.j of the RFP and G.7, Installation-Accountable Government Property, NFS 1852.245-71, page 14-15, for a list of GFE.

Question #63: In regards to the Work Management System in L.13, 3:

- What tool is being used now? What will NASA make available from a tool standpoint or a license standpoint?
- What systems is the CSV file coming from? What kind of information is NASA transmitting?
- Can the Work Management System be implemented directly onto NASA's system?

Answer #63: The Government does not own the existing system. NASA cannot make the existing tool available to the Offerors. A CSV file is a known standard format. NASA does not own the system.

Question #64: L.15, Volume III, Cost/Price Volume: Table B.3

Table B.3 in the RFP provides rows for Price and Fixed Fee. Are the Price rows supposed to be Total Costs not including Fee, instead of the Price including both Costs and Fee, such that the Grand Total will be the sum of the values entered in the table?

Answer #64: Yes.

Question #65: L.15, Volume III, Cost/Price Volume: Attachment J-8 Historical WYEs compared to Attachment J-14 Labor Category Descriptions

The following labor categories are included in Attachment J-8 Historical WYEs but not in Attachment J-14 Labor Category Descriptions:

- Program Administration Specialist - Level 1
- Program Administrative Assistant 2
- Program Administration Specialist - Level 1

What are the Labor Category Descriptions for these positions?

Answer #65: Reference answer to question 18.

Question #66: L.15, Volume III, Cost/Price Volume: Attachment J-9 IDIQ Rates, Attachment J-15 IDIQ WYEs, & Attachment J-16 IDIQ Price Template compared to Attachment J-14, Labor Category Descriptions

The following labor categories are included in Attachment J-9 IDIQ Rates, Attachment J-15 IDIQ WYEs, and Attachment J-16 IDIQ Price Template but are not included in Attachment J-14 Labor Category Descriptions:

- Intranet Engineer
- Sr. Subject Matter Expert 4
- Sr. Subject Matter Expert 7

What are the Labor Category Descriptions for these positions?

Answer #66: Reference answer to question #18.

Question #67: L.15, Volume III, Cost/Price Volume: Attachment J-15 IDIQ WYEs

Attachment J-15 IDIQ WYEs provides data by Fiscal Years but the pricing requirements are by Contract Year. How should the IDIQ WYEs data be mapped to Contract Years?

Answer #67: The title on the attachment should read contract years. See revised Attachment J-15.

Question #68: L.15, Volume III, Cost/Price Volume: WYEs Excel Pricing Model (EPM) Templates

Some columns in the RFP EPM template worksheets (such as SCT and LPT) have the heading "Total WYEs." Given that Contract Year periods in the model have varying number of months, such that just summing values would not be representative of WYEs, do these columns need to be populated and if so how?

Answer #68: The contract will be for a 20-month basic effort, one 24-month option, one 16-month option and one 6-month extension. Each of the Core Work Areas shall be priced by each of the Government Fiscal Years (GFY) and an optional 6 month extension. (See Table – Contract Period of Performance in Section L.15).

Question #69: L.15, Volume III, Cost/Price Volume: Attachment J-8, Historical WYEs

Does this work year represent a partial year to date or is it your estimate for the entire year?

Answer #69: The historical data provided in Attachment J-8 is for a fiscal year.

Question #70: Why is there no Program/Project Manager listed in any of the historical Work Year Equivalent data?

Answer #70: The historical work year data is direct technical labor to support technical tasks.

Question #71: L.15.2 General Instructions e.L.15 (k) "Offerors shall submit the templates in Microsoft Excel format and shall not submit scanned versions in the electronic submittal unless specifically allowed herein.

All electronic files must be searchable and will not contain scanned documents."

How does the government wish to have letters and bank statements inserted into the electronic version of the cost proposal if they cannot be scanned?

Answer #71: This applies to the Cost Volume; all electronic files must be searchable and will not contain scanned documents." Letters and bank statements may be scanned.

Question #72: L.9 (b) Will the government allow Arial Narrow font or fonts within the Arial family?

Answer #72: No.

Question #73: L.15 (k) "In addition to hard copies, a copy of the proposal shall be prepared and submitted in "Word for Windows," version Microsoft Word 2010 and/or "Excel for Windows," version Microsoft Excel 2010 formats and shall be provided on quality, virus-scanned, virus-free CD-ROM disks. All electronic files must be searchable and will not contain scanned documents. PDF format is acceptable for graphics and photos only. Two disks shall be provided, one shall be marked "Backup Disk." Each electronic media provided and storage case shall have an external label affixed indicating: the name of the Offeror; the RFP number; and a list of the files contained on the electronic media and are marked in accordance with FAR 3.104."

Does the government wish for Volumes I and II to be in the same Word or PDF format with the same labeling scheme?

Answer #73: The wording on in the RFP in section L.12 4 (d) will be changed to be consistent with section L.15 (k).

Question #74: Will the government allow a Cross Reference Matrix to be excluded from the page count and included in Volume I?

Answer #74: No. Reference answer to question 38.

Question #75: L.13 2.A.; PWS 2 "PWS 2: The Contractor shall submit a Management Plan that defines how the Contractor will manage their day-to-day operations."

Is the required Management Plan outside of the Volume I page count?

Answer #75: No.

Question #76: PWS 2.4 “The Contractor shall create, modify, maintain, and implement a contract-wide Risk Management Plan per NPR 7120.7, NASA Information Technology and Institutional Infrastructure Program and Project Management Requirements, and NPR 2810.1.

Is the Risk Management Plan described in PWS 2.4 required with this proposal? If so, it is excluded from the Technical page count?

Answer #76: The Risk Management Plan is required with this proposal and is included as part of Volume I and its page count.

Question #77: L.5 “The Offeror shall provide, with its offer, the following information that is required to make payment by electronic funds transfer (EFT) under any contract that results from this solicitation. This submission satisfies the requirement to provide EFT information under paragraphs (b)(1) and (j) of the clause at 52.232-34, Payment by Electronic Funds Transfer - Other than Central Contractor Registration.”

In which volume and section does the government wish the offeror to provide the EFT information specified in Section L.5?

Answer #77: EFT information is provided when a government vendor or potential government vendor registers what was known as Central Contractor Registry (CCR) and now is SAM (System for Award Management). It need not be provided twice.

Question #78: L.15.3; L.15; Table L-1 In Section L.15.3, Section 2 is labeled as “Summary Cost Data” while Table L-1 calls Section 2 “ Price Summary (EPM Template)”. Which is correct?

Answer #78: The Summary Cost Data section (section heading) is requesting the Offeror provides its response using the Price Summary template, attachment J-17.

Question #79: Section C 3.2.1. Application Monitoring and Administration Page 16 of 69 “The Contractor shall provide life cycle support of enterprise and business application software in support of client/server, Web and Hyperion applications development...”

Hyperion refers to a suite of products from Oracle. Can the government please specify which Hyperion products/modules are in use at GRC and included in the PACE IV solicitation?

Answer #79: Hyperion Interactive Reporting version 9.2.03

Question #80: Section C 3.2.3. Website Development and Maintenance Page 18 of 69 “The Contractor shall provide web page development, content reviews, and training in support for GRC Web content. Web sites are currently developed in many web programming languages, including HTML, HTML5, and PHP. Future web development activities are moving to Content Management Systems, including WordPress and Drupal.”

In reference to 'Future web development activities are moving to Content Management Systems...', can the government elaborate on developments to date, or plans for a center-wide CMS? Is the language implying the evaluation and implementation of such systems or the support of existing systems?

Answer #80: Support of existing systems. Namely, WordPress and Drupal. As budgets allow, the Government will be moving towards wider implementation of the CMS.

Question #81: Section C 3.2.4 Web and Application Graphic Design Page 18 of 69 “The Contractor shall provide services for electronic creation and manipulation of graphics products that support web application and mobile application development.”

Does GRC have a 'Media Solutions Branch' that supports graphics development and multi-media productions? If so, does the language in this section speak to employing full time resources for this office or the simply ability to support the graphical need of application development?

Answer #81: The interpretation should be that the SOW scope is for support for graphics in the context of web and mobile application development.

Question #82: Section C 3.2.6. Custom Application Development Page 19 of 69 “In support of the environment for custom application development, the Contractor shall operate and maintain the development environment (ColdFusion) and associated databases (Oracle). These environments are to be maintained in accordance with NASA policies.”

Question #82.a: Can the government elaborate on the current ColdFusion environment (e.g. what versions of ColdFusion are in use, release number and standard/enterprise)?

Question #82.b: Can the government indicate whether there is an active policy to migrate away from ColdFusion or will it continue to be a development option for PACE IV?

Answer #82.a: ColdFusion Enterprise 9.0.0.251028; Update Level CHF9000003.jar; Java Version 1.7.0-21

Answer #82.b: While the current development environment is ColdFusion, the environment is under review to meet NASA's future application requirements. The current ColdFusion environment will require support for a number of years. The decision for the future environment is not yet established, however .NET, php, Java, Ruby on Rails, Python, and future versions of ColdFusion are being considered as contenders, among others.

Question #83: We have one follow-up Question #set related to pricing (J-9) as follow:

Attachment J-9 IDIQ Rates: We noticed that only a subset of the J-14 Labor Categories are included; in some cases, one or two levels are omitted. We also noticed that there are 9 new labor categories listed in J-9 that are not included in J-14 Labor Category Descriptions. We would like to confirm that the J-9 Labor Categories are the complete set of LCs for which GRC would like IDIQ rates. Also, we would like to verify that for the new ones, GRC will not be providing an qualifications guidance but rather will allow the offerors to assess the appropriate qualifications for those positions based on already provided information in J-14. Lastly, we would like to confirm that offerors can add labor categories as appears to be indicated in J-9 ad as offerors determine might be needed to respond to the scope of work.

Answer #83: Reference answer to question 18.

Question #84: Section L.12.b.2 (p. 68) of the RFP states that “Plastic Bindings ONLY are requested for the submitted paper proposal information.” We interpret this instruction to mean the Government does not want offerors to use 3-ring binders for hard-copy submissions, but wishes for hard copies to be spiral-bound. Is this correct?

Answer #84: Both spiral bound and 3-ring binders are acceptable.

Question #85: Section L.9.b of the RFP (p. 66) states that offerors should use “not smaller than 11 point Arial type, including tables, figures, and graphics.” Will the government revise this instruction to allow the use of smaller, but still legible (e.g., 8 point), typefaces in figures, tables, and graphics, considering that the

Government has provided tables for offerors' use in past performance and cost that use smaller than 11 point Arial type?

Answer #85: Reference answer to question 22.

Question #86: Intentionally left blank.

Answer #86: Intentionally left blank.

Question #87: Section L.12.b.2 (p. 68) of the RFP states that "Paper proposals shall be tabbed and separated into the following distinct sections ..." Given the page limits for the Mission Suitability volume, is it sufficient to provide tabs and force page breaks for just the top-level sections (i.e., Technical Requirements, Management Plan, and Work Management)?

Answer #87: Yes.

Question #88: Section L.13.1.B.2 (p. 71) of the RFP, when describing the questions that offerors should Answer #for Technical Scenario 2, states "d. How the increase need for resources is handled during the development and on-going." This sentence appears to be incomplete; is there a word or phrase that should follow the word "on-going"?

Answer #88: The word "support" was inadvertently omitted from the scenario. The sentence should read, "d. How the increased need for resources is handled during the development and on-going support."

Question #89: Section L.13.2.D.6 (p. 73) of the RFP states that the prime and all subcontractors shall, in the Management Plan section of the Mission Suitability volume, address "a plan in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement 1852.231-71, Determination of Compensation Reasonableness, which sets forth salary ranges and fringe benefits proposed for employees." In our experience, these plans are typically provided in the Cost/Price volume of the proposal because they are quite lengthy and include price-sensitive data. With this in mind, we ask that the Government please Answer #the following questions:

- a. When the Government asks that offerors "address" the plan in the Mission Suitability volume, is it sufficient to simply acknowledge that the prime and all subcontractors have compensation plans that are in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement 1852.231-71?
- b. If the Government desires details of the compensation plans for the prime and all subcontractors, may those details be provided as part of the Cost/Price volume?
- c. If the Government desires details of the compensation plans for the prime and all subcontractors in the Mission Suitability volume, may those details be excluded from the page limitations of the Mission Suitability volume?

Answer #89a: No.

Answer #89b: Provide a summary of your compensation plan in the Management Plan. It is allowable to include your total compensation plans in a separate section of the price volume.

Answer #89c: Yes, reference answer to question 89b.

Question #90: Section L-5 (p. 64) of the RFP states that offerors shall provide "information that is required to make payment by electronic funds transfer." How does the Government wish for offerors to provide this information (i.e., what section of the Price/Cost volume, etc.)?

Answer #90: Reference answer to question 77.

Question #91: Section M.2.2.A.4 (p. 93) of the RFP states that the Government will evaluate “relationships among technical management, business management, subcontract management, and the associated overheads.” However, the related instruction in Section L.13.2.A.4 (p. 72) asks offerors to describe only “relationships between technical management, business management, and subcontract management.” Does the Government wish for offerors to provide information related to management overheads or not?

Answer #91: No. The sentence in Section M.2.2.A.4 should read, “relationships among technical management, business management, and subcontract management.”

Question #92: Section L.14.A (p. 75) of the RFP provides a table of required information for the past performance narrative and states that “Offerors shall utilize the numbering system/format below when submitting past experience and performance information.” Can offerors alter this table, so long as the numbering system is preserved? For example, could two numbered items be placed on the same row? Also, should we increase the type size to 11 point to comply with the instruction in Section L.9.b?

Answer #92: Yes, the Offerors may alter this table as long as the numbering system is preserved. Yes, the type size should be Arial 11 point to comply with instructions in Section L.9.b.

Question #93: In Section L.15 (p. 88) of the RFP, under the heading “Cost Volume Part 3 – Offeror’s Pricing Model (OPM), the Government states that offerors should provide an OPM that follows “the format specified in Table 15-2 of FAR 15.408.” However, this FAR instruction appears to request the same information already provided in the other Parts and Sections of the Cost/Price Volume. What is the difference between the Cost/Price Volume, with its included Excel Pricing Model (EPM), and the OPM?

Answer #93: The OPM is provided in your format; the EPM is provided utilizing our format. Should there be discrepancies between an Offeror’s electronic and hardcopy version of their cost proposal data, the hard copy version takes precedence over all electronic versions of the proposal.

Question #94: Section L.15.3, Section 3.a (p. 81) of the RFP states that “Wage/salary increases shall be in compliance with any applicable union agreements, collective bargaining agreement, wage determination, etc.” Several of the provided Excel templates also refer to “Union” or “CBA” rates. Is there a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with any unions associated with the incumbent NASA PACE workforce? If so, we ask that the Government please include this CBA with the solicitation documents so that offerors may price appropriately.

Answer #94: The Government is not aware of a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with any unions associated with the incumbent PACE workforce.

Question #95: To ensure price normalization among both incumbent and non-incumbent bidders, will the Government provide plug numbers for all materials and ODCs that are related to the procurement of NASA IT assets, as well as any government directed travel?

Answer #95: Reference answer to question 19.

Question #96: In Section L.13.2.D.2 (p. 73), Section L.15.1.h (p. 77) and L.15.3, Section 1 (p. 80), the Government refers to “the Offeror and subcontractors.” Does the Government intend for these instructions to apply to “all” subcontractors, regardless of size or work share?

Answer #96: The references on pages 73, 77, and 80 apply to all.

Question #97: In Sections L.15.3-Part 1-Section 3 and L.15.3-Part 1-Section 3.b (p. 81) of the RFP, the Government states that offerors shall provide “... a detailed explanation of learning curve application ...” and “... adequate documentation in support of all ... learning curve application for recurring labor.” Will the Government please define the phrase “learning curve application” in the context of these instructions?

Answer #97: Learning curve application is the cost of coming up to speed to fully perform the requirements of the contract.

Question #98: The following labor categories, listed in Attachment J-8, do not have corresponding labor category descriptions in Attachment J-14, which the Government has directed offerors to use for mapping purposes.

- Intranet Engineer
- Network Specialist Level 2
- Principal Subject Matter Expert Level 3
- Program Admin Specialist 1
- PROGRM ADMIN ASS'T 2
- Software Engineer Level 3
- Sr. Subject Matter Expert 4
- Sr. Subject Matter Expert 7
- Standardization Specialist
- Subject Matter Expert Level 5

We ask that the Government please provide an updated Attachment J-14 that includes descriptions for these labor categories.

Answer #98: Reference answer to question 18.

Question #99: In Section L.15.3 (p. 89) of the RFP, when discussing the elements of Cost Volume – Part 4 Contractor Basis of Estimate, the Government states “i) For software explain the rationale for and estimates used for new, modified, re-used, and programmer productivity.” Will the Government please define “programmer productivity” in this context? Does this refer to an estimate of required programmer hours?

Answer #99: Yes, programmer productivity refers to the estimate of the required programmer hours.

Question #100: In Section L.15.3-Part 1-Section 3.i.3 (p. 82) of the RFP, the Government states that “For Government Furnished Property currently being used under the existing PACE III contract, Offerors shall discuss how they have priced the cost of transferring the property from its current location to the Offeror’s facilities ...” To allow non-incumbent offerors to address this requirement, we ask that the Government please provide the following information:

Question #100.a: Descriptions of Government Furnished Property (GFP) located at any contractor facility under the PACE III contract.

Question #100.b: Identification of the area within the EPM spreadsheets where offerors should include pricing for the transfer of any identified GFP.

Question #100.c: Confirmation that all offeror personnel who are directly supporting the PACE IV project can reside on-site at a NASA facility.

Question #100.d: Clarification of any Government expectations that offerors should house staff directly supporting PACE IV at the offerors’ own facilities.

Answer #100.a: Under PACE III, there is not GFP located at a contractor facility

Answer #100.b: Reference answer to question 100a.

Answer #100.c: Confirmed.

Answer #100.d: Reference answer to question 54.

Question #101: In order to provide offerors with a fair opportunity to submit a realistic and competitive Basis of Estimate (per RFP Section L.15.3-Part 1-Section 3 “Pricing Narrative Basis of Estimate and Supporting Data”), we ask that the Government Answer #the following questions:

Question #101.a: What is the technical architecture to be supported at GRC under the PACE IV contract, including servers by quantity (physical/virtual, operating systems), type (e.g., database, application, network), number of web sites, percentage of COTS vs. customized applications, and percentage of applications in development as opposed to sustainment.

Question #101.b: How many graphics productions by type (e.g., audio, video, document), multimedia maintenance work orders, and devices are supported annually?

Question #101.c: How many service requests are received annually?

Question #101.d: How many change requests are processed annually?

Question #101.e: How many training classes are given annually for the Information Technology Security Awareness and Training Center (ITSATC).

Question #101.f: How many training courses are developed annually for the ITSATC.

Question #101.g: What percentage of ITSATC training courses is web-based rather than instructor-led?

Question #101.h: How many security plans are produced annually?

Answer #101a: Reference answer to question 33.

Answer #101b: Varies annually depending on program needs and available funding.

Answer #101c: Varies annually depending on program needs and available funding.

Answer #101d: Varies annually depending on program needs and available funding.

Answer #101e: The ITSATC manages approximately 20 courses.

Answer #101f: This depends on the need for additional courses and needed modification to the courses. The contractor should be prepared to develop 2-5 courses per year; however, the Government is also looking at adopting existing products as a cost savings.

Answer #101g: Currently 100% of the courses are web-based. ITSATC managed instructor-led courses should be thought of as an addition to complement the web-based courses. Briefings are given to students in the various NASA GRC programs 2-4 times per year.

Answer #101h: The GRC Risk Management and Security Office manages approximately 40 system security plans.

Question #102: In Attachments J-5, J-6, and J-7, the summary spreadsheet includes a cell that is labeled “award fee at maximum”. Is this where the Offeror’s proposed fixed fee should be entered?

Answer #102: This should read “Fee at Maximum” referring to the proposed fixed fee. Refer to updated Attachments J-5, J-6, and J-7.

Question #103: Do all references in the EPM spreadsheets to “award fee” actually refer to the fixed fee that should be proposed for this RFP?

Answer #103: Yes.

Question #104: In Section L.14.A (p. 75) of the RFP, in reference to the past performance narrative, the Government states “The Offeror should include only those contracts under which work was performed by an organizational entity or entities (e.g., specific Division or Subsidiary of a parent company) included in the Offeror’s proposal.” Companies who have acquired entities and/or contracts and fully integrated those entities and/or contracts even though they still bear the legal name of the original entity would be prohibited from delivering a compliant, highly competitive, and innovative proposal response as a result of this language. With this in mind, we ask that the Government remove the sentence referenced above from the instructions.

Answer #104: The intent of the referenced sentence is to ensure that the government is evaluating the past performance of Offerors that are being proposed to conduct relevant work on this contract. If the Offeror has acquired an organizational entity with relevant past performance, the Offeror should make clear the relationship between the entity being proposed to do the work under this contract and the entity with the relevant past performance. This RFP sentence will not be changed.

Question #105: In Section L.14.B (p. 76) of the RFP, in reference to past performance questionnaires, the Government states “The Offeror shall send three Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment J-3) per entity on the Offeror’s proposing team ...” Because major subcontractors may be performing just 10% of the work, we ask that the Government please revise this instruction to read: “The prime Offeror shall send three Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment J-3). All major subcontractors shall submit up to three Past Performance Questionnaires that, in aggregate, represent efforts of similar size, scope and magnitude to the portions of the requirement they will be performing.”

Answer #105: Reference answer to question 60.

Question #106: Section L.15.1.m (p. 78) of the RFP references FAR clause 16.304-3(a)(3). We cannot locate this specific subsection of the FAR clause. In addition, FAR clause 16.304 addresses Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee contracts, although the Government has stated throughout the RFP that it anticipates awarding a Cost Plus Fixed Fee contract. We ask that the Government please clarify the appropriate FAR clause for offerors to reference in relation to this section of the RFP.

Answer #106: The correct clause is 16.301-3(a)3.

Question #107: Section L.15.1.i (p. 77) of the RFP indicates that “... proposals are not required to be cost certifiable ...” and that “... comprehensive audits will be made on a case-by case basis upon receipt of the proposals.” However, Section L.15.1.m (p. 78) of the RFP indicates that “... Offeror’s and their proposed subcontractors must submit documents from the cognizant Government agency showing their accounting system is approved for tracking and separating costs for cost reimbursement contracts. If the Offeror cannot demonstrate that they have an adequate government approved accounting system before award, the contract cannot be awarded to the Offeror.” These statements appear to be contradictory. We ask that the Government please clarify whether or not an approved accounting system is required for the prime or any subcontractors before award.

Answer #107: Reference answer to question 58.

Question #108: In Section L.15.3-Part 1-Section 3.a (p. 81) of the RFP, the Government states that “Wage/salary increases shall be in compliance with any applicable union agreements, collective bargaining agreement, wage determination, etc.” In addition, several of the provided Excel templates also mention “SCA” and “WD”. In order for offeror’s to price appropriately, we ask that the Government:

Question #108.a: Incorporate the applicable Wage Determination into the solicitation to ensure offerors are pricing the correct SCA rates and categories

Question #108.b: Provide information about which positions in which Statement of Work areas should be considered under the SCA

Question #108.c: Provide a mapping of the current WYE labor categories to the applicable Wage Determination categories

Answer #108a: No.

Answer #108b: No.

Answer #108c: No.

Question #109: Attachment J-8, Historical WYEs, maps the current WYEs to the three Core Work Areas at a high level. To allow offerors to provide the Government with the most cost effective staffing model against the Statement of Work (SOW), we ask that the Government please provide information regarding the mapping of the current WYEs against individual detailed SOW elements.

Answer #109: The mapping will not be provided. The government is interested in receiving novel, cost effective approaches. The historical information has been provided for reference. This RFP approach is to enable Offerors the opportunity to provide unbiased, innovative, and creative proposals.

Question #110: At various places throughout the RFP, the Government references NASA Procedures and Guidelines (NPR) as guidance for offerors and directs offerors to the NASA NODIS Library for details. On the NODIS web site, there are links on the left side for Center Directives, including GRC. However, the GRC link does not appear to be functional. To facilitate offerors' ability to comply with the required NPRs, we ask that the Government provide access to the text of specific GRC Directives, either by repairing the link on the NODIS web site or through a separate PACE IV electronic proposal library.

Answer #110: The NPR's and NPD's, referenced in the RFP, can be accessed by utilizing the search feature under "Agency Level Directives" at the NODIS site (<http://nodis3.gsfc.nasa.gov/>).

Question #111: In Amendment 003, Section L.3.A.12, in reference to the WMS demonstration version, the Government states that offerors shall include a signed certification that "shall also include a statement that no monitoring of the site shall be done." In order to comply with NIST Special Publication 800-53, Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations, which sets out statutory responsibilities under the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA), contractors who host government web sites and applications are required to "monitor the security controls in the information system and environment of operation on an ongoing basis ...". Therefore, to comply with federal regulations, we cannot certify that no monitoring of the site shall be done. However, we can certify that we will not perform any monitoring activity other than that required by FISMA. We ask that the government please confirm that this certification is acceptable.

Answer #111: It is anticipated that the WMS demo will be hosted on the Offeror's web site for proposal evaluation purposes. Therefore, this IT security restriction does not apply for this evaluation event.

Question #112: The following links to web sites cited in the RFP do not appear to be functioning or are otherwise inaccessible to offerors:

- 52.204-2 (p. 20)
- http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/portals/pl/new_tech_pocs.html (p.21)
- <http://netsdata.grc.nasa.gov> (p. 23)
- http://osat-ext.grc.nasa.gov/gso/manual/chapter_index.shtml (p. 27)
- <https://itsecurity.nasa.gov/policies/index.html> (p. 43)
- <http://www.arnet.gov/far/> (p. 59)

Can the Government repair these web links or provide the information accessed by these web links to offerors by other means?

Answer #112:

- The text of the clause 52.204-2 is:
 FAR 52.204-2 Security Requirements.
 As prescribed in 4.404(a), insert the following clause:
 Security Requirements (Aug 1996)
 (a) This clause applies to the extent that this contract involves access to information classified “Confidential,” “Secret,” or “Top Secret.”
 (b) The Contractor shall comply with—
 (1) The Security Agreement (DD Form 441), including the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (DoD 5220.22-M); and
 (2) Any revisions to that manual, notice of which has been furnished to the Contractor.
 (c) If, subsequent to the date of this contract, the security classification or security requirements under this contract are changed by the Government and if the changes cause an increase or decrease in security costs or otherwise affect any other term or condition of this contract, the contract shall be subject to an equitable adjustment as if the changes were directed under the Changes clause of this contract.
 (d) The Contractor agrees to insert terms that conform substantially to the language of this clause, including this paragraph (d) but excluding any reference to the Changes clause of this contract, in all subcontracts under this contract that involve access to classified information.
 (End of clause)
- The new technology and patent rights retention information at the site http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/portals/pl/new_tech_pocs.html is only needed by the Contractor after contract award.
- The waste reduction reporting information at the site <http://netsdata.grc.nasa.gov> is only needed by the Contractor after contract award.
- The correct site for the NASA GRC Safety Manual is <http://smad-ext.grc.nasa.gov/shed/pub/gsm/gsm-manual.pdf>. This is a correction to the site (http://osat-ext.grc.nasa.gov/gso/manual/chapter_index.shtml) listed on page 27.
- The IT Security Awareness training policy at the site <https://itsecurity.nasa.gov/policies/index.html> is now Attachment J-18.
- The correct site for the full text of the solicitation provisions is <http://www.acquisition.gov/far/>. This is a correction to the site (<http://www.arnet.gov/far/>) listed on page 59.

Question #113: In Section L.15.3-Part 2, j.3.ii (p. 87) of the RFP, the Government states that “Offerors shall use the “position” descriptions in RFP Section J, Attachment J-14 cross walked to their labor descriptions.” Because the labor descriptions in Attachment J-14 are apparently from the incumbent’s GSA schedule and not specific to the PACE IV Statement of Work (SOW) requirements, they do not contain sufficient detail to provide offerors with information on the relevant skill sets required for the SOW areas. We ask that the Government please provide more detailed labor category descriptions that are specific to the PACE IV work requirements.

Answer #113: Reference answer to question 18.

Question #114: pg.66 L.9 Proposal Page Limitations

The Government states that the font must be no smaller than 11 point Arial for tables, figures, and graphics. Most proposals we have responded to relax the font type restriction for tables, figures, and graphics. Since

Arial 11 does not lend itself well to developing graphics, will the Government consider revising the font type requirement to no smaller than 10 point for tables, figures and graphics?

Answer #114: Reference answer to question 22.

Question #115: pg.66 L.9 Proposal Page Limitations

The RFP specifies that Volume I – Mission Suitability is limited to 70 pages, not including key personnel resumes and responses to technical scenarios. Given the extensive amount of requirements including our understanding and approach to all SOW areas which are comprised of multiple tasks and appendices, a management plan that includes a phase-in and staffing plan, and the request for detailed information regarding our proposed work management system, will the government consider adding an additional 25 pages to Volume I to allow adequate room for explanation of all requested information? Including such a restrictive page limitation would require offerors to greatly limit the data supplied to the Government thereby making evaluations much more difficult.

Answer #115: No.

Question #116: pg.68 L.12 Proposal Preparation Instructions

The instructions state that two (2) electronic copies of the proposal are required for Volumes I, II and III. Will the Government please clarify if each volume should be on a separate CD, or if all Volumes should be included on one CD?

Answer #116: Provide each volume on separate CD's (total of 6 CD's).

Question #117: pg.68 L.12 Proposal Preparation Instructions

In regards to the tabbing and separation requirements for Volume II: Relevant Experience/Past Performance, will the government please clarify if the prime and major subs' Past Performance Narratives shall be tabbed separately?

Answer #117: This is Offeror's preference.

Question #118: pg.75 L.14 Volume II: Relevant Experience/Past Performance Instructions

In regards to Section A. Past Performance Narrative (PPN), will the Government please clarify how many past performance references are required from the Offeror and major subcontractors?

Answer #118: Per Section L.14 A, the Offeror shall provide past experience and performance information for past or current contracts that are relevant in terms of size, content, and complexity. The Offeror shall only include contracts held within the past three years of the solicitation issue date. The Offeror shall submit past experience and performance information for major subcontractors in accordance with the above.

Question #119: pg.76 L.14 Volume II: Relevant Experience/Past Performance Instructions

In regards to Section B. Past Performance Questionnaires, the Government states, "The Offeror shall send three Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment J-3) per entity on the Offeror's proposing team." Will the Government please confirm that three Past Performance Questionnaires are required for the Offeror as well as three additional Past Performance Questionnaires for each major subcontractor?

Answer #119: Reference answer to question 60.

Question #120: pg.79 L.15 Volume III: Cost/Price Volume Instructions

The Government states, "Offerors and major subcontractors are required to submit one hard copy and one electronic copy of the cost proposal directly to the Government audit office identified in the cover page of the cost proposal concurrent with submittal of the proposal to NASA."

Will the Government please confirm that in addition to submitting one (1) original and two (2) identical hard copies and two (2) electronic copies of the cost proposal to NASA, the Offeror is required to send one (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic copy of the cost proposal to the Government audit office. If this is correct, will the Government please provide to address of the Government audit office since the address on the cover page appears to be the same as the address for the submittal of the proposal to NASA?

Answer #120: Yes, the Offeror is required to send one hard copy and one electronic copy to the government audit office of the Offeror's DCMA cognizant officer. The address of the government audit office is provided by the Offeror on the cover page of the cost proposal.

Question #121: pg.80 L.15 Volume III: Cost/Price Volume Instructions

The instructions state, "Part 3 and Part 4 shall be in separate binders for ease of use during proposal evaluation." Will the Government please clarify if the instructions mean that Part 3 and Part 4 shall be bound together so that they are separate from Part 1 and Part 2, or if the instructions mean Part 3 and Part 4 shall be bound separately from one another?

Answer #121: Part 3 and Part 4 shall be bound separately from one another.

Question #122: pg.80 L.15 Volume III: Cost/Price Volume Instructions

In regards to Part 3 and Part 4 being bound separately, can the Government please clarify if separate CDs are also required for Part 3 and Part 4?

Answer #122: Separate CDs are not required.

Question #123: pg.7 Attachment J-1 Statement of Work C.2.5 Property Management

Section C.2.5 Property Management states that "The contractor shall use a Government specified application as a tool, or set of tools, to administer Government property." Does the Government currently possess and operate an application for property management? If so, will the Government please name the tool currently in use and indicate whether the same application will be available for use by the incoming contractor?

Answer #123: Yes, the application will be available for use by the Contractor. The name of the tool is N-PROP.

Question #124: pg.9 Attachment J-1 Statement of Work C.3 Information Services

Section C.3 Information Services states that the majority of the work shall be accomplished onsite, but "Certain tasks may benefit from offsite delivery models (e.g. transactional, short-duration tasks; subject matter expertise reachback)." However, the pricing templates provided with the solicitation (Attachments J-05, J-06, and J-07) do not allow for pricing both onsite and offsite resources. Given that offsite work is a future possibility it is our assumption that we would be provided an opportunity to price any offsite work if and when the needs arises. Please confirm if this is an accurate assumption.

Answer #124: The pricing templates apply to both onsite and offsite work. Offsite pricing may be included in the Excel pricing model.

Question #125: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

In order to reasonably provide a production ready WMS customized to suit NASA GRC needs, please provide technical design documentation, interface documentation (including data schema, entity relationship diagram, data format for ETL, etc.), user manuals, administrative manuals, and training manuals for the existing system.

Answer #125: The information is not available because the Government does not own the existing system.

Question #126: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Does the current work management system satisfactorily meet every requirement as set forth in the RFP, Attachment A, and the evaluation criteria?

Answer #126: The requirements for PACE III are not relevant to the evaluation of Offerors proposing to the PACE IV RFP. The requirements for the PACE IV WMS are found in Section 2.2.1 of the SOW and its associated Appendix A.

Question #127: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Does the government currently receive a periodic data feed from the existing WMS? If so, please provide the format and a sample instance of the data file.

Answer #127: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #128: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Is the existing system based on a COTS/GOTS product? If so, please provide product name, version, and any modules or packages? Has the product been customized to meet NASA GRC needs? If so, please provide details of the customizations?

Answer #128: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #129: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Were any of the customizations of the existing system performed by incumbent contractor personnel under the PACE III contract? If so, are the customizations considered government-owned?

Answer #129: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #130: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Is the existing system currently deployed on government equipment/site or contractor equipment/site? If the existing system is hosted at contractor site, does it integrate with Launchpad eAuthentication?

Answer #130: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #131: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Please provide specific integration details for using Launchpad authentication mechanisms as well as utilizing NASA Access Management System mechanisms.

Answer #131: Reference answer to question 34.

Question #132: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

How many users will need access to the WMS? What is a breakdown of roles (e.g. approvals, rejections, read-only)? Will there be users other than Government representatives requiring access?

Answer #132: Approximately 100 users. Roles will be defined during the 60-day phase-in. Access will be limited to Government representatives, including a limited number of NASA contractor personnel.

Question #133: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Does this requirement require a redundant system on both Government furnished equipment as well as a contractor hosted solution?

Answer #133: No.

Question #134: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

The requirements listed in Appendix A are inadequate to achieve a production-ready system at proposal submission. Please provide a complete requirements document for the WMS.

Answer #134: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #135: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Please clarify “production ready and user friendly” as described in row a within Appendix A with a formal requirements document.

Answer #135: Reference answers to questions 11 and 126.

Question #136: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Can the government please define the requirements for configuring to Agency interoperability standards and functionality on multiple form factors.

Answer #136: Agency interoperability standards are defined in NASA-STD-2804 (current version P) and NASA-STD-2805 (current version is P).

Question #137: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Please clarify “robust search capability” as discussed in row h within Appendix A with a formal requirements document.

Answer #137: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #138: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Please define the security requirements referenced in row "i" within Appendix A with a formal requirements document.

Answer #138: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #139: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Can the government provide the requirements for authentication utilizing NASA’s LaunchPad mechanisms?

Answer #139: Reference answer to question 34.

Question #140: 41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Can the government provide the requirements for authentication utilizing NASA’s Access Management System mechanisms?

Answer #140: NASA’s Access Management System (NAMS) is utilized for provisioning authorization for access to applications. The requirement is that the WMS shall utilize NAMS for provisioning user access to the WMS.

Question #141: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

How would the government envision integrating NASA’s authentication mechanisms with the contractor-supplied WMS during the evaluation period? Further, would NASA expect a period for C&A prior to deploying a third-party system tightly integrated with NASA operations identity management solutions? How would this be delivered on day-one of the performance period?

Answer #141: It is not expected that the demonstration version of WMS will be integrated with NASA’s authentication mechanisms. The Contractor shall work with the GRC Risk Management and Security Office for appropriate C&A during phase-in. It is anticipated this integration can be accomplished within the 60-day phase-in.

Question #142: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

What standard reports are required? What are the requirements for ad-hoc and customized reporting?

Answer #142: Reference answer to question 126.

Question #143: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

What agency and Center security policies are applicable?

Answer #143: FISMA, FISMA related NIST documents, related procedures in NODIS, NASA-STD-2804, and NASA-STD-2805.

Question #144: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

We believe it is an unreasonable request for a non-incumbent bidder to be expected to have a production ready work management system at the time of proposal submission. Will the government please reconsider the requirements for a production-ready WMS as an evaluated part of the proposal submission?

Answer #144: A fully functional WMS is necessary for successful contract performance at contract start. Therefore, it is prudent to evaluate a production-ready WMS as part of the submission.

Question #145: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

From our understanding, the current WMS being used at NASA has been developed and customized over the past several years by the incumbent contractor based on evolving NASA requirements. As the incumbent can propose their existing solution either directly or as a member of a bidding team, this creates an unfair advantage. Will the government please reconsider the requirements for a production-ready WMS as an evaluated part of the proposal submission?

Answer #145: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #146: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

The RFP does not contain detailed requirements that would allow any non-incumbent bidder to comprehensively satisfy the high level descriptions. Even with detailed requirements, it is unreasonable for non-incumbent bidders to build a WMS in a 6 week proposal period and have it ready for NASA review. Will the government please reconsider the requirements for a production-ready WMS as an evaluated part of the proposal submission?

Answer #146: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #147: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Row "m" of Appendix A requires the import of a comma delimited data file with current and new core work areas and IDIQ task order data prior to full performance. Does "full performance" mean "start of performance"? Further, would the government provide the data file for our inclusion in the Work Management System? If not, would the government provide the format for the comma delimited data file?

Answer #147: Yes, full performance begins on contract start date of February 1, 2014. The referenced requirement in Appendix A occurs during the phase-in period, beginning December 1, 2013. The data will be provided, in a comma delimited file, during the phase-in period.

Question #148: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

In order to effectively incorporate government responses to WMS related requirements questions, there must exist a reasonable period of time for implementation of a working WMS. Will the government approve a period of 8 weeks subsequent to furnishing requirements clarifying the high-level descriptions currently in the solicitation for bidders to reasonably implement a demonstration solution for the WMS?

Answer #148: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #149: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

In order to satisfy row a of Appendix A, will there be any opportunity for iterative feedback from the government during the evaluation of the WMS to ensure the solution meets the requirements at the beginning of the performance period?

Answer #149: No, your system is frozen upon submission per Amendment 3 to the RFP. Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #150: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Will the current system in use by GRC be available for bidding by the incumbent?

Answer #150: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #151: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Was the current work management system developed by incumbent prime contractor during the PACE 3 contract?

Answer #151: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #152: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Was the current work management system developed by the incumbent prime contractor during billable hours?

Answer #152: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #153: pg.41-42, 74 Appendix A WMS L.13.3.A Work Management System

Is the current WMS customized to NASA's specifications? If so, were the requirements gathering efforts and/or the customizations performed funded directly or indirectly by NASA?

Answer #153: Reference answers to questions 126 and 144.

Question #154: Attachment J-08 Historical WYEs, Attachment J-09 IDIQ Rates, Attachment J-14 Labor Category Descriptions

There is a discrepancy in the list of labor categories in the three referenced attachments. Many labor categories appear in Attachment J-09 IDIQ Rates that are not found in Attachments J-08 and J-14, so there is no labor category description provided. Additionally, J-08 and J-14 provide some labor categories and descriptions that are not included in Attachment J-09. Would the government please clarify if labor category descriptions will be provided for those labor categories in Attachment J-09 that are not provided in Attachment J-14?

Answer #154: Reference answer to question 18.

Question #155: Attachment J-09 IDIQ Rates

Is the Offeror permitted to propose additional labor categories other than those named on the tabs in this file? Many rows are pre-populated with "(insert labor category)", implying that the Offeror is free to propose additional labor categories if desired.

Answer #155: Reference answer to question 18.

Question #156: pg.85 Section 7, Cost Volume, Part 2 – Excel Pricing Model (EPM) (a.)

The table under Paragraph (a.) lists seven workbooks that comprise the EPM. Where are the Excel files for "Price Summary.xlsx" and "IDIQ Price Template.xlsx"? The table notes the file locations are Sections L.1 and L.5 respectively, but the Excel file templates are not located in Sections L.1 and L.5.

Answer #156: Reference answer to question 2. Reference answer to question 3.

Question #157: Attachments J-5, J-6, J-7

The Price Templates provided in Attachments J-5, J-6, and J-7 show an example of Fringe costs being included on the "OHT" Overhead tab. If the Offeror has a separate Fringe pool, are permitted to modify this workbook to include a Fringe tab? Or may Fringe cost be included as a component of Direct Labor cost?

Answer #157: Offerors can modify the EPM by adding columns and rows to fit their proposal information as necessary.

Question #158: pg.84 Section L.15, Vol. III Cost/Price Volume Instructions: Specific Instructions, Cost Volume, Part I – EPM (Section 7 – Proposed Prime Offeror/Subcontractor Information Summary)

Will the Government please explain the intent of Table L-2. Is the Offeror required to complete this table based on the services being offered/proposed under this solicitation? For example, the Offeror assumes that Type of Action shall be listed as "A New Contract" for the impending prime contract award and "A New Subcontract" for impending subcontract awards. If this assumption is correct, then please confirm whether the Prime Offeror is required to complete Table L-2 summarizing all services proposed by the Team in addition to individual Table L-2s for each major subcontractor proposed.

Answer #158: The Prime and all major Subcontractors are required to provide the information requested in table L-2.

Question #159: pg.84 Section L.15, Vol. III Cost/Price Volume Instructions: Specific Instructions, Cost Volume, Part I – EPM (Section 7 – Proposed Prime Offeror/Subcontractor Information Summary)

With regards to Socioeconomic Business Subcontracting Goals, it is our assumption that only the Prime Offeror will be required to complete this section of the table and that the Prime Offeror will determine the Socioeconomic Business Goals. Please confirm if this assumption is correct.

Answer #159: The Prime and all major Subcontractors are required to provide the information requested in table L-2.

Question #160: SOW section 3.8.3 refers to Appendix I and Appendix M. Please confirm the reference to Appendix I should be corrected to "M."

Answer #160: Yes, Appendix I should be corrected to "M."

Question #161: SOW section 3.8.3 mentions "... system availability and service response times..." but Appendix M does not address "availability." Please clarify.

Answer #161: Reference Appendix M and Work Area #3.

Question #162: Respectfully request the due date on PACE IV be extended. This proposal is proving very complex and will require more time to do it right.

Answer #162: The Government feels that appropriate time has been given for proposals. The due date remains June 28, 2013, at 12 p.m.